		Casedseps:09-00-up#04bwijjDuddiddeidikii/3	mean was pita and particular and a mean was a market and		
Fenwick & West LLP attorners at Law Mountain View	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Kathryn J. Fritz (SBN 148200) Rachael G. Samberg (SBN 223694) FENWICK & WEST LLP 275 Battery Street, Suite 1500 San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 875-2300 Facsimile: (415) 281-1350 E-mail: kfritz@fenwick.com  Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant PROTEGO NETWORKS, INC., now Protego Networks LLC, and Counterclaim Defendants PARTHA BHATTACHARYA, IMIN LEE & YU LIAO	Kim Zeldin (SBN 135780) Ronald S. Kravitz (SBN 129704) LINER YANKELEVITZ SUNSHINE & REGENSTREIF LLP 199 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105-2255 Telephone: (415) 489-7700 Facsimile: (415) 489-7701 E-Mail: kzeldin@linerlaw.com  JoAnna M. Esty (SBN 147903) LINER YANKELEVITZ SUNSHINE & REGENSTREIF LLP 1100 Glendon Avenue, 14th Floor Los Angeles, California 90024-3503 Telephone: (310) 500-3500 Facsimile: (310) 500-3501 E-Mail: jesty@linerlaw.com  Howard G. Silverman (pro hac vice) Vincent C. Cataldo (pro hac vice) KANE AND SILVERMAN P.C. The Philadelphian 2401 Pennsylvania Avenue Suite 1c-44 Philadelphia, PA 19130 Telephone: (215) 232-1000 Facsimile: (215) 232-1000 Facsimile: (215) 232-0181 E-Mail: hgs@palegaladvice.com, vcc@palegaladvice.com		
	16	Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaiman DANIEL N. ZENCHELSKY	Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant		
	17				
	18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION			
	19				
	20	PROTEGO NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware	Case No. C05-00464 MJJ		
	21	corporation,	STIPULATION AND PROPOSED		
	22	Plaintiff, v.  DANIEL N. ZENCHELSKY,  Defendant.	ORDER RE: LEAVE FOR ZENCHELSKY TO FILE THIRD AMENDED ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIM AND GRANT OF EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH TO REPLY		
	23				
	25				
	26	AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM.	Complaint Filed: February 1, 2005		
	27				
	28				
		STIPULATION CASE NO. C05-00464 MJJ			

Cascer3:e05:-05-00-4004464JJMJJD Obourn erret n7:173 Filleed 10034/2112/2000 6 PagFeagleo f1 3 of 3

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

WHEREAS, on October 11, 2005 this Court issued an order dismissing Defendant and
Counterclaimant Zenchelsky's ("Zenchelsky") Fifth Cause of Action for Declaratory Judgment a
to Authorship, Inventorship and Ownership and his Sixth Cause of Action for Correction of
Inventorship relating to United States Patent Application No. 2004/0260763, citing a lack of
jurisdiction to hear such claims relating to a pending United States patent application;

WHEREAS, on January 10, 2006, United States Patent Application No. 2004/0260763 issued as United States Patent No. 6,985,920 ("'920 Patent");

WHEREAS, now that the relevant patent has issued, Zenchelsky, believing the issues are ripe for adjudication by this Court, intends to amend his Second Amended Answer and Counterclaim ("SAC") to include causes of action for Declaratory Judgment as to Authorship, Inventorship and Ownership relating to '920 Patent, and for Correction of Inventorship relating to '920 Patent;

WHEREAS, Zenchelsky's Second Amended Answer and Counterclaim ("SAC") does not reflect the fact that the copyright applications under review at the time his SAC was filed have since been granted;

WHEREAS, Zenchelsky intends to amend his SAC to reflect the fact that relevant copyrights have been granted to him;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendants do not object to the amendments described above, or to Zenchelsky filing a Third Amended Answer and Counterclaim ("TAAC") to incorporate such amendments;

IT IS THEREFORE STIPULATED, by and between counsel for the parties, who are authorized to execute this Stipulation on their clients' behalf, as follows:

Zenchelsky shall be permitted to file his Third Amended Answer and Counterclaim to restate the Fifth and Sixth Causes of Action that were dismissed by this Court on October 11, 2005, to reflect the fact that the '920 Patent has issued and to reflect the fact that Zenchelsky's copyright applications described in his Second Amended Answer and Counterclaim were granted. As a courtesy, Zenchelsky will grant Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendants until April 29, 2006 to respond to Zenchelsky's Third Amended Answer and Counterclaim.

## $Ca \textbf{See} \textbf{See} \textbf{S:05-004004464JJMJJD} \textbf{Document} \textbf{7i} \textbf{773} \quad \textbf{Filter} \textbf{1000481120000} \textbf{6Pa} \textbf{geo} \textbf{6Sof} \textbf{3}$

	,	IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
	1		FENWICK & WEST LLP	
	2	Dated. Water 97, 2000		
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	3	I	By: Rachael Samberg Rachael G. Samberg	
	4		Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant	
	5	Ţ	PROTEGO NETWORKS, INC., now Protego Networks LLC, and Counterclaim Defendants PARTHA BHATTACHARYA, IMIN LEE & YU LIAO	
	6			
	7	Dated: March <u>3</u> \(\frac{2}\) 2006		
	8		LINER YANKELEVITZ SUNSHINE & REGENSTREIF LLP  By:  Joshua S Levenberg  Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant DANIEL N. ZENCHELSKY	
	9			
	10			
	11			
	12			
	13 14			
	14	(PROP	<del>POSED  ORDER</del>	
		PURSUANT TO THE ABOVE STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.		
	16		of Jarin of Jeneire	
	17 18	Dated: 4/12/2006, <del>2005</del>	THE HONORABLE MARTIN J. JENKINS UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	
	18			
	20			
	21			
	22			
	23			
	24			
	25			
	26			
	27			
	28			
		STIPULATION CASE NO. C05-00464 MJJ	3	